

An inequality for a class of Markov processes.

Mohammud Foondun

Abstract

Let $\alpha \in (0, 2)$ and consider the operator $\mathcal{L}$ given by

$$\mathcal{L}f(x) = \int [f(x+h) - f(x) - 1_{(|h| \leq 1)} h \cdot \nabla f(x)] \frac{n(x, h)}{|h|^{d+\alpha}} dh,$$

where the term $1_{(|h| \leq 1)} h \cdot \nabla f(x)$ is not present when $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Under some suitable assumptions on the kernel $n(x, h)$, we prove a Krylov-type inequality for processes associated with $\mathcal{L}$. As an application of the inequality, we prove the existence of a solution to the martingale problem for $\mathcal{L}$ without assuming any continuity of $n(x, h)$.

Subject Classification: Primary 60H10

Keywords: Jump processes, stable processes, integral equations

1 Introduction and main results.

The main object of study of this note is a class of stable-like processes associated with the following operator

$$\mathcal{L}f(x) = \int [f(x+h) - f(x) - 1_{(|h| \leq 1)} h \cdot \nabla f(x)] \frac{n(x, h)}{|h|^{d+\alpha}} dh, \quad (1.1)$$

where when $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, the term $1_{(|h| \leq 1)} h \cdot \nabla f(x)$ is not present. When $\alpha \in [1, 2)$, this term is needed for the integral to converge. We discard it when $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ because otherwise, the process will be dominated by the drift. Here and throughout this paper, we associate a process to a given operator through the martingale problem of Stroock and Varadhan [12].

This class of integral operators have received quite a bit of attention lately. For example, see [5] where the uniqueness of the solution to the martingale problem for the above operator was considered. In [4], a Harnack inequality for

harmonic functions of this operator was proved. For very recent results involving this operator, see [1] and the references therein for a sample of relevant papers. Here the corresponding process is a purely discontinuous one. Discontinuous processes are proving to be very useful in physics and in finance. The book [6] provides a lot of information about financial modelling using jump processes. It is therefore important to study properties of non-local operators like the ones defined by (1.1).

We will need some notations before we can state our main results. The ball of radius R and center x will be denoted by $B(x, R)$ and the stopping time τ_D is defined by

$$\tau_D = \inf\{t > 0; X_t \notin D\}.$$

We will also make the following assumptions:

Assumption 1.1. (a) There exists a positive constant κ such that

$$n(x, h) \geq \kappa \quad \forall x, h \in \mathbf{R}^d.$$

(b) There exist positive constants K and $\beta \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$|n(x, h) - 1| \leq K(1 \wedge |h|^\beta) \quad \forall x, h \in \mathbf{R}^d.$$

The following is the first main result of the paper.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $x_0 \in \mathbf{R}^d$ and $R \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$. Suppose that (P^x, X_t) solves the martingale problem associated with $\mathcal{L}$ started at $x \in B(x_0, R)$. Then under Assumptions 1.1, there exists a positive number p such that for any measurable function $f \in L^p(\mathbf{R}^d)$, the following holds*

$$\left| \mathbb{E}^x \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_{B(x_0, R)}} f(X_s) ds \right| \leq c(R) \|f\|_{L^p(B(x_0, R))}, \quad (1.2)$$

where $c(R) \rightarrow 0$ as $R \rightarrow 0$ and p satisfies $d/p \leq \min\{\alpha, \beta\}$.

The above inequality was first proved by Krylov in [9] for a d -dimensional diffusion process. Kurenok proved a variant of this inequality for stable process with index $\alpha \in (1, 2)$. See [8] for more information. In [7], Lepeltier and Marchal derived such an inequality for diffusions with jumps. They considered processes associated with an integro-differential operator which is the sum of a uniformly elliptic operator and a non-local part. Their proof is an adaptation of Krylov's original proof. Here our operator is a purely non-local one so we need to adopt a different strategy; we use a perturbation method where we compare the operator $\mathcal{L}$ with that of the generator of a stable process.

This inequality is very useful in the study of stochastic differential equations and their applications to control theory, filtering problems and so on. Here, as an application of this inequality, we obtain the existence of a solution to the martingale problem associated with the operator $\mathcal{L}$. The novelty of this result is that no continuity of the jump kernel is required.

Theorem 1.3. *Suppose Assumptions 1.1 hold. Then for every $x \in \mathbf{R}^d$, there exists a solution to the martingale problem for $\mathcal{L}$ starting at x .*

We end this introduction with some remarks concerning Assumptions 1.1. That $n(x, h)$ is bounded below and above is the analog of strict ellipticity of an elliptic operator in non-divergence form. For small $|h|$, Assumption 1.1 says that our jump kernel is close to that of a stable process. Such a condition seems to be required for the inequality (1.2) to hold. In fact, in [3] Bass has constructed a process which spends a positive amount of time in a set of measure zero. This violates inequality (1.2) and a close examination of the process constructed in [3] reveals that its jump kernel does not satisfy the second part of Assumption 1.1. The paper is structured as follows. In section 2, we derive some estimates which will be needed in the proof of Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.3 which we prove in sections 3 and 4 respectively.

2 Some estimates.

As mentioned in the introduction, we will use a perturbation method to prove our result. To this end, we define the following operator

$$\mathcal{L}_0 f(x) = \int [f(x+h) - f(x) - 1_{(|h| \leq 1)} h \cdot \nabla f(x)] \frac{1}{|h|^{d+\alpha}} dh, \quad (2.1)$$

where the term $1_{(|h| \leq 1)} h \cdot \nabla f(x)$ is not present when $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. We now let $p_t(x, y)$ denote the transition density function of the process associated the operator $\mathcal{L}_0$ and define

$$r^\lambda(x) = \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t} p_t(0, x) dt, \quad (2.2)$$

where λ is a strictly positive constant. We will need upper bounds on r^λ and its derivatives. But first let us make the following definition which will make the subsequent proofs read easier.

$$\begin{aligned} F_x(y, h) &:= |r^\lambda(x+h-y) - r^\lambda(x-y) - 1_{(|h| \leq 1)} h \cdot \nabla r^\lambda(x-y)|, \\ G_x(y, h) &:= \frac{|n(x, h) - 1| |f(y)|}{|h|^{d+\alpha}}, \\ I_{\alpha, x}(f) &:= \int_{|x-y| \leq 1} \frac{|f(y)|}{|x-y|^{d-\alpha}} dy, \\ J_{\alpha, x}(f) &:= \int_{|x-y| > 1} \frac{|f(y)|}{|x-y|^{d+\alpha}} dy, \end{aligned}$$

where f is a measurable function. In the above, the term $1_{(|h| \leq 1)} h \cdot \nabla r^\lambda(x-y)$ is not present whenever $\alpha \in (0, 1)$.

Proposition 2.1. *There exists a positive constant $c \in (0, \infty)$ such that the following hold:*

$$\begin{aligned}
(a) \quad & r^\lambda(x) \leq c(\frac{1}{\lambda}|x|^{-2\alpha} \wedge 1)|x|^{-d+\alpha}, \\
(b) \quad & \sum_i \left| \frac{\partial r^\lambda(x)}{\partial x_i} \right| \leq c(\frac{1}{\lambda}|x|^{-2\alpha} \wedge 1)|x|^{-d+\alpha-1}, \\
(c) \quad & \sum_{i,j} \left| \frac{\partial^2 r^\lambda(x)}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} \right| \leq c(\frac{1}{\lambda}|x|^{-2\alpha} \wedge 1)|x|^{-d+\alpha-2}.
\end{aligned}$$

We omit the proof of the above proposition since it can be found in [11]. The following estimates will be important for our perturbation argument to work.

Proposition 2.2. *There exists a positive constant $c(\alpha, \beta, d)$ such that,*

$$\begin{aligned}
(a) \quad & \int_{|x-y| \leq 1} \int F_x(y, h) G_x(y, h) \, dh \, dy \leq c(I_{\beta, x}(f) + I_{\alpha, x}(f)), \\
(b) \quad & \int_{|x-y| > 1} \int F_x(y, h) G_x(y, h) \, dh \, dy \leq cJ_{2\alpha, x}(f).
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. We prove only the first part of the proposition and focus only on the case when $\alpha \in [1, 2)$. The remaining part of the proof is similar. We begin by splitting the integral as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{|x-y| \leq 1} \int F_x(y, h) G_x(y, h) \, dh \, dy \\
&= \int_{|x-y| \leq 1} \int_A F_x(y, h) G_x(y, h) \, dh \, dy \\
&= \int_{|x-y| \leq 1} \int_B F_x(y, h) G_x(y, h) \, dh \, dy \\
&= \int_{|x-y| \leq 1} \int_C F_x(y, h) G_x(y, h) \, dh \, dy \\
&= I_1 + I_2 + I_3,
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
A &:= (h \in \mathbf{R}^d; |h| \leq |x-y|/2) \\
B &:= (h \in \mathbf{R}^d; |x-y|/2 < |h| \leq 3|x-y|/2) \\
C &:= (h \in \mathbf{R}^d; |h| > 3|x-y|/2).
\end{aligned}$$

We consider I_1 first and use Proposition 2.1 and Assumption 1.1(b) to write

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1 &\leq c_1 \int_{|x-y| \leq 1} \int_A \left(\sup_{z \in B(|x-y|, |x-y|/2)} \Delta r^\lambda(z) \right) \frac{|f(y)|}{|h|^{d+\alpha-\beta-2}} \, dh \, dy \\
&\leq c_2 \int_{|x-y| \leq 1} \frac{|f(y)|}{|x-y|^{d-\beta}} \, dy \\
&= c_2 I_{\beta, x}(f).
\end{aligned}$$

To deal with the second inequality, we consider the corresponding region of integration and use Proposition 2.1 to write

$$\begin{aligned} F_x(y, h) &\leq c_3 \left[\frac{1}{|x+h-y|^{d-\alpha}} + \frac{1}{|x-y|^{d-\alpha}} + \frac{|h|}{|x-y|^{d-\alpha+1}} \right] \\ &\leq c_4 \left[\frac{1}{|x-y|^{d-\alpha}} + \frac{1}{|x+h-y|^{d-\alpha}} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

We now use Assumption 1.1(b) together with the above to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{|x-y|\leq 1} \int_B F_x(y, h) G_x(y, h) \, dh \, dy \\ &\leq c_5 \left[\int_{|x-y|\leq 1} \int_B \frac{|f(y)|}{|x-y|^{d-\alpha}} \frac{1}{|h|^{d+\alpha-\beta}} \, dh \, dy \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_{|x-y|\leq 1} \int_B \frac{|f(y)|}{|x+h-y|^{d-\alpha}} \frac{1}{|x-y|^{d+\alpha+\beta}} \, dh \, dy \right] \\ &\leq c_6 \int_{|x-y|\leq 1} \frac{|f(y)|}{|x-y|^{d-\beta}} \, dy \\ &= c_6 I_{\beta, x}(f). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we look at the third integral and its corresponding region of integration to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} F_x(y, h) &\leq c_7 \left[\frac{1}{|x+h-y|^{d-\alpha}} + \frac{1}{|x-y|^{d-\alpha}} + \frac{|h|1_{(|h|\leq 1)}}{|x-y|^{d-\alpha}} \right] \\ &\leq c_8 \left[\frac{1}{|x-y|^{d-\alpha}} + \frac{|h|1_{(|h|\leq 1)}}{|x-y|^{d-\alpha}} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

The above together with the second part of Assumption 1.1 yield

$$\begin{aligned} I_3 &\leq c_9 \int_{|x-y|\leq 1} \int_{3|x-y|/2}^1 \frac{|f(y)|}{|x-y|^{d-\alpha}} \frac{1}{|h|^{d+\alpha-\beta}} \, dh \, dy \\ &\quad + c_{10} \int_{|x-y|\leq 1} \int_{3|x-y|/2}^1 \frac{|f(y)|}{|x-y|^{d-\alpha+1}} \frac{1}{|h|^{d+\alpha-\beta-1}} \, dh \, dy \\ &\quad + c_{11} \int_{|x-y|\leq 1} \int_1^\infty \frac{|f(y)|}{|x-y|^{d-\alpha}} \frac{1}{|h|^{d+\alpha}} \, dh \, dy \\ &= c_{12} [I_{\alpha, x}(f) + I_{\beta, x}(f)]. \end{aligned}$$

We now combine the above inequalities to obtain the result. $\square$

The first part of the following proposition is the crucial estimate for the proof of Theorem 1.2.

Proposition 2.3. *Let*

$$u(x) = \int_{\mathbf{R}^d} r^\lambda(x-y) f(y) \, dy,$$

where f is a measurable function. Then, there exists a positive constant $c(d, \alpha, \beta)$ such that

- (a) $|\mathcal{L}u(x) - \mathcal{L}_0u(x)| \leq c[I_{\alpha,x}(f) + I_{\beta,x}(f) + J_{2\alpha,x}(f)],$
(b) $|u(x)| \leq c[I_{\alpha,x}(f) + J_{\alpha,x}(f)].$

Proof. We prove part (a) first. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{L}u(x) - \mathcal{L}_0u(x)| &\leq \iint F_x(y, h)G_x(y, h) \, dh \, dy \\ &= \int_{|x-y| \leq 1} \int F_x(y, h)G_x(y, h) \, dh \, dy \\ &\quad + \int_{|x-y| > 1} \int F_x(y, h)G_x(y, h) \, dh \, dy. \end{aligned}$$

Part (a) of the proposition is readily obtained once we apply Proposition 2.2. For part (b), we use Proposition 2.1 to write

$$\begin{aligned} |u(x)| &\leq c_1 \int_{|x-y| \leq 1} \frac{|f(y)|}{|x-y|^{d-\alpha}} \, dy + c_2 \int_{|x-y| > 1} \frac{|f(y)|}{|x-y|^{d+\alpha}} \, dy \\ &= c_1 I_{\alpha,x}(f) + c_2 J_{\alpha,x}(f). \end{aligned}$$

□

3 Proof of Theorem 1.2.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. We begin by setting $u(x) = \int_{\mathbf{R}^d} r^\lambda(x-y)g(y) \, dy$, where g is a smooth function so that u satisfies

$$\mathcal{L}_0u(x) - \lambda u(x) = -g(x) \quad x \in \mathbf{R}^d. \quad (3.1)$$

Since (P^x, X_t) solves the martingale problem associated with $\mathcal{L}$ started at x , we have

$$u(X_t) - u(X_0) - \int_0^t \mathcal{L}u(X_s) \, ds = \text{martingale}.$$

Multiplying the above by $\lambda e^{-\lambda t}$ and integrating from $t = 0$ to $t = \infty$, we obtain

$$-u(X_0) - \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda s} (\mathcal{L}u - \lambda u)(X_s) \, ds = \text{martingale},$$

which in turn yields

$$-u(x) = \mathbb{E}^x \left[\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda s} (\mathcal{L}u - \lambda u)(X_s) \, ds \right].$$

We now use (3.1) to write the right hand side of the above equality as follows

$$\begin{aligned} -u(x) &= \mathbb{E}^x \left[\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda s} (\mathcal{L}u - \mathcal{L}_0 u)(X_s) ds \right] + \mathbb{E}^x \left[\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda s} (\mathcal{L}_0 u - \lambda u)(X_s) ds \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}^x \left[\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda s} (\mathcal{L}u - \mathcal{L}_0 u)(X_s) ds \right] - \mathbb{E}^x \left[\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda s} g(X_s) ds \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Rearranging the above two equalities and using Proposition 2.3, we obtain

$$\left| \mathbb{E}^x \left[\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda s} g(X_s) ds \right] \right| \leq c_1 (I_{\alpha,x}(g) + I_{\beta,x}(g) + J_{\alpha,x}(g) + J_{2\alpha,x}(g)).$$

After noting that the above inequality holds for L^p -functions as well, we choose $g(X_s) = f(X_s)1_{(s \leq \tau_{B(x_0, R)})}$ where f is an L^p -function. For this choice of g , $J_\gamma(g) = 0$ for all $\gamma > 0$. Moreover, by using Hölder's inequality and the fact that $\frac{d}{p} \leq \alpha$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} I_{\alpha,x}(f) &\leq c_2 \int_{B(x_0, R)} \frac{|f(y)|}{|x - y|^{d-\alpha}} dy \\ &\leq c_3 R^{\alpha-d/p} \|f\|_{L^p(B(x_0, R))}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above estimates, we obtain

$$\left| \mathbb{E}^x \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_{B(x_0, R)}} f(X_s) ds \right| \leq c(R) \|f\|_{L^p(B(x_0, R))},$$

where the constant $c(R)$ depends on α, β, κ and K as well. $\square$

4 Proof of Theorem 1.3.

We begin this section with the following construction due to Meyer. Suppose that we have two jump kernels $n_0(x, h)$ and $n(x, h)$ with $n_0(x, h) \leq n(x, h)$ and such that for all $x \in \mathbf{R}^d$,

$$N(x) = \int_{\mathbf{R}^d} (n(x, h) - n_0(x, h)) dh \leq c.$$

Let $\mathcal{L}'$ and $\mathcal{L}_0$ be the operators corresponding to the kernels $n(x, h)$ and $n_0(x, h)$ respectively. If $\overline{X}_t^0$ be the process corresponding to the operator $\mathcal{L}_0$, then we can construct a process $\overline{X}_t$ corresponding to the operator $\mathcal{L}'$ as follows. Let S_1 be an exponential random variable of parameter 1 independent of $\overline{X}_t$, let $C_t = \int_0^t N(\overline{X}_s) ds$, and let U_1 be the first time that C_t exceeds S_1 . At the time U_1 , we introduce a jump from $\overline{X}_{U_1-}$ to y , where y is chosen at random according to the following distribution:

$$\frac{n(\overline{X}_{U_1-}, h) - n_0(\overline{X}_{U_1-}, h)}{N(\overline{X}_{U_1-})} dh.$$

This procedure is repeated using an independent exponential variable S_2 . And since $N(x)$ is finite for any finite time interval, we have introduced only a finite number of jumps. In [10], it is proved that the new process corresponds to the operator $\mathcal{L}'$.

We will also need the following in the proof of Theorem 1.2.

Proposition 4.1. *Suppose for each k that $P_k(X_0 = x) = 1$ and that for every $f \in C_b^2$ there exists c_f (depending only on $\|f\|$ and $\|f''\|$) such that $f(X_t) - f(X_0) - c_f t$ is a P_k -supermartingale. Then*

- (a) *the sequence P_k is tight on the space of càdlàg functions,*
- (b) *$P_k(\tau_{B(x,R)} \leq t) \leq c_1 t / R^2$, c_1 is independent of x .*

Proof. See Propositions 3.1 and 3.2 of [2]. □

Proof of Theorem 1.2.. Define the jump kernel $n_k(x, h)$ as follows

$$n_k(x, h) = \begin{cases} \frac{n(x, h)}{|h|^{d+\alpha}} & \text{for } |h| > \frac{1}{k} \\ \frac{1}{|h|^{d+\alpha}} & \text{for } |h| \leq \frac{1}{k}. \end{cases}$$

Let $\mathcal{L}_k$ be the operator corresponding to $n_k(x, h)$. For each k , there exists a solution P_k^x to the martingale problem associated to the operator $\mathcal{L}_k$. The existence of the solution P_k^x can be justified by the fact that for small h , the jump kernel of $\mathcal{L}_k$ is that of a symmetric stable process of index α . Using Meyer's construction, we can add the big jumps (i.e $|h| > \frac{1}{k}$) and get a process corresponding to $\mathcal{L}_k$. It follows from our assumptions and Proposition 4.1(a) that P_k^x is tight on the space of càdlàg functions.

Relabeling if necessary, let P_k^x be a subsequence which converges to a probability measure, P^x . We need to show that P^x is a solution to the martingale problem associated with $\mathcal{L}$. It suffices to show that

$$E_k^x \left[Y \left[\int_0^t \mathcal{L}_k f(X_s) ds \right] \right] \rightarrow E^x \left[Y \left[\int_0^t \mathcal{L} f(X_s) ds \right] \right] \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty, \quad (4.1)$$

where $Y = \prod_{i=1}^m g_i(X_{r_i})$, $r_1 \leq r_2 \leq \dots \leq r_m \leq t$ and the g_i s are continuous functions bounded by 1. Using Taylor's formula and Assumption 1.1(b), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{L} f(x) - \mathcal{L}_k f(x)| &= \left| \int_{|h| \leq \frac{1}{k}} [f(x+h) - f(x) - 1_{(|h| \leq 1)} h \cdot \nabla f(x)] \frac{[n(x, h) - 1]}{|h|^{d+\alpha}} dh \right| \\ &\leq c_1 \left(\frac{1}{k} \right)^{2-\alpha+\beta}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

where c_1 depends on the function f . To show (4.1), we write

$$\begin{aligned}
I^k(x) &= \left| \mathbb{E}_k^x \left[Y \left[\int_0^t \mathcal{L}_k f(X_s) ds \right] \right] - \mathbb{E}^x \left[Y \left[\int_0^t \mathcal{L} f(X_s) ds \right] \right] \right| \\
&\leq \left| \mathbb{E}_k^x \left[Y \left[\int_0^t (\mathcal{L}_k - \mathcal{L}) f(X_s) ds \right] \right] \right| \\
&+ \left| \mathbb{E}_k^x \left[Y \left[\int_0^t \mathcal{L} f(X_s) ds \right] \right] - \mathbb{E}^x \left[Y \left[\int_0^t \mathcal{L} f(X_s) ds \right] \right] \right| \\
&= I_1 + I_2.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

Using Theorem 1.2, we can bound I_1 as follows,

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1 &\leq \left| \mathbb{E}_k^x \left[|Y| \left[\int_0^{t \wedge \tau_{B(x,R)}} (\mathcal{L}_k - \mathcal{L}) f(X_s) ds \right] \right] \right| \\
&+ \left| \int_{\tau_{B(x,R)} \leq t} |Y| \int_0^t |(\mathcal{L}_k - \mathcal{L}) f(X_s)| ds d\mathbb{P}^x \right| \\
&\leq c_2 \|\mathcal{L} f(x) - \mathcal{L}_k f(x)\|_{L^p(B(x,R))} \\
&+ c_3 \mathbb{P}^x(\tau_{B(x,R)} \leq t) \|\mathcal{L} f(x) - \mathcal{L}_k f(x)\|_{L^\infty}.
\end{aligned}$$

Inequality (4.2) and Proposition 4.1(a) yield $I_1 \leq c_4 \left(\frac{1}{k}\right)^{2-\alpha+\beta}$. So for large enough k , we have $I_1 \leq \epsilon/2$. Finally the weak convergence of $\mathbb{P}_k^x$ yields $I_2 \leq \epsilon/2$ for large k . Hence the theorem is proved. $\square$

Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank Richard Bass for suggesting this problem.

References

- [1] Bass, Richard (2009). Regularity results for stable-like operators, *Journal of Funct. Anal.* **257**, 2683–2722.
- [2] Bass, Richard (1988). Uniqueness in law for pure jump processes, *Probab. Theory Related Fields.* **79**(2), 271–287.
- [3] Bass, Richard (1984) Local times for a class of purely discontinuous martingales. *Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie verw. Gebiete.* **67**, 433–459.
- [4] Bass, Richard and David Levin (2002). Harnack inequalities for jump processes, *Potential Anal.* **17**(4), 375–388.
- [5] Bass, Richard and Huili Tang (2009). The martingale problem for a class of stable-like processes, *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **49**, 1144–1167.
- [6] Cont, Rama and Peter Tankov (2004). *Financial modelling with jump processes*, Chapman & Hall/CRC. Boca Raton, FL, 2004.

- [7] Lepeltier, Jean Pierre and Bernard Marchal (1976). Problème des martingales et equations differentielles stochastiques associés a un operateur integro-differentiel. *Annales IHP* **12**(1), 43–103.
- [8] Kurenok, Vladimir (2008). A note on L_2 estimates for stable integrals with drift. *Transaction of the A.M.S* **360**(2), 925–938.
- [9] Krylov, Nicolai (1971). An inequality in the theory of stochastic processes. *Th. Prob. Applic.* **16**, 438–448.
- [10] Meyer, Paul André (1976). Renaissance, recollements, mélanges, ralentissement de processus de Markov. *Ann. Inst. Fourier.* **25**(3-4), 464–497.
- [11] Tang, Huili (2006). Uniqueness for the martingale problem associated with pure jump processes of variable order. *preprint*.
- [12] Stroock, Daniel and S.R. Srivasa Varadhan (1979). *Multidimensional diffusion proceeses.*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York.

Mohammud Foondun

School of mathematics, Loughborough University, Leicestershire, LE11 3TU.

Emails: mohammud@math.utah.edu, m.i.foondun@lboro.ac.uk